UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,659	10/06/2003	Jai Rawat	AOL0040C	5799

22862 7590 08/22/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
LEE, PHILIP C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/680,659	**Applicant(s)** RAWAT ET AL.	
	Examiner Philip C. Lee	**Art Unit** 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 June 2006*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-64* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-64* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/2/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-64 are presented for examination.

2. The information disclosure statement submitted on 6/2/06 was not consider because the applicant fails to provide copy of each of the references listed in the information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 22 is claims a computer program product comprising a tangible medium having computer readable code. This could be a piece of paper with written codes. Accordingly, it is a program *per se*, and not one of the categories of statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-20, 22-41, 43-62 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light et al, U.S. Patent 6,192,380 (hereinafter Light) in view of Quass et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0083068 (hereinafter Quass).

6. Light and Quass were cited in the previous office action.

7. As per claims 1 and 22, Light teaches the invention substantially as claimed for a browser-based method for filling out an electronic form automatically without use of a stored map of said form, comprising the steps of: mapping said form by said browser based on analysis of at least one visible form elements proximate said at least one form field by analyzing text expressions of a page containing said form, said page comprising an untransformed HTML page, and populating said at least one form field by said browser with data retrieved according to said mapping in a format specified by said mapping without user intervention (abstract; col. 2, lines 53-55; col. 3, lines 48-62; col. 4, lines 13-15).

8. Light did not teach configurable area of a page. Quass teaches analyzing text expressions within a configurable area of a page (page 5, parag. 54).

9. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass in order to enhance Light's automatic form fill-in method by identifying input element using the descriptive text.

10. As per claim 43, Light teaches the invention substantially as claimed for a browser-based system for filling out an electronic form automatically without use of a stored map of said form, comprising: a browser; at least one data file; rules for mapping visible form elements to correct data from said file; and computer-readable code means for mapping said form by said browser based on analysis of at least one visible form element proximate said at least one form field by analyzing text expressions of a page containing said form, said page comprising an untransformed HTML page, and populating said at least one form field by said browser with data retrieved according to said mapping in a format specified by said mapping without user intervention; wherein said code is executable on a client running said browser, and wherein said rules and said code are stored on said client (abstract; col. 2, lines 53-55; col. 3, lines 48-62; col. 4, lines 13-15).

11. Light did not teach configurable area of a page. Quass teaches analyzing text expressions within a configurable area of a page (page 5, parag. 54).

12. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass in order to enhance Light's automatic form fill-in method by identifying input element using the descriptive text.

13. As to claims 2, 23, and 44, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 22, and 43 above. In addition, Light discloses identifying fields based on analysis of visible field labels proximate said at least one field, when said labels are present (col. 3, Lines 48-62, and col. 5, Lines 55-60). Light does not disclose evaluating user visible display format hints proximate said fields to determine required display format. Quass, on the other hand, discloses evaluating user visible display format hints proximate said fields to determine required display format (((0052)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

14. As to claims 3, 24, and 45, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 23 and 44 above. In addition, Light discloses traversing page elements in a first sequence (inherent in col. 3, Line 48).

15. As to claims 4, 25, and 46, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 24 and 45 above. In addition, Quass discloses if a field is positioned in a table cell, analyzing text expressions in adjacent cells, analyzing a text expression within a predetermined number of words and in at Yeast one predetermined direction from said fields, based on page coordinates, examining said page in general vicinity of the field in all directions from the field and analyzing

text expression closest to said field, and disregarding text expressions embedded within parentheses or quotation marks ((0054)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

16. As to claims 5, 26, and 47, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4, 25, and 46 above. In addition, Light and Quass discloses comparing the analyzed text expressions with entries in a field Label dictionary to find closest match with a metadata expression, wherein said field is mapped to correct metadata (Light, col. 3, lines 60-62, col. 5, Lines 61-65, Quass, (0014)).

17. As to claim 6, 7, 27, 28, 48, and 49, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 24 and 45 above. In addition, Quass discloses mapping the field according to context when the field lacks a visible field Label by identifying mapping of at Yeast one field preceding a current field in said first sequence, and mapping said current field based on said mapping of said preceding field (:0052) and 10054)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

18. As to claims 8, 29, and 50, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 24 and 45 above. In addition, Light discloses mapping the field based on analysis of a programmatic field name when a field lacks a visible field label (col. 3, Lines 3-5,48-65).

19. As to claims 9, 30, and 51, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 24 and 45 above. In addition, Light discloses when a field lacks a visible field Label, comparing the field's default value with entries in a field label dictionary to find closest match with a metadata expression, wherein said field is mapped to correct metadata (col. 3, lines 60-62 and col. 5, Lines 61-65).

20. As to claim 10, 31, and 52, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 24 and 45 above. In addition, Quass discloses if a field is a select field, comparing selection options with entries in a field Label dictionary to find closest match with a metadata expression, wherein said field is mapped to correct metadata ((0037), and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

21. As to claims 11, 32, and 53, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3, 24 and 45 above. In addition, Quass discloses for sets of radio buttons, creating a new object for each set ((0042), (0044), and (0056)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

22. As to claims 12, 15, 33, 36, 54, and 57, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3 and 24 above. In addition, Quass discloses identifying block type, wherein a block

comprises a plurality of related fields ((0014)). Moreover, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that a set of form fields as classified by Quass would constitute related field such as billing address; shipping address; credit card information; and email address. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

23. As to claims 13, 34, and 55, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 12, 33 and 54 above. In addition, Quass discloses comparing programmatic field name of at Yeast a current field with arrays of metadata expressions for each block type; comparing visible form elements for at Yeast said current field with arrays of metadata expressions for each block type; and where said current field occupies a table cell, analyzing text expressions at least from first cell of said table to cell occupied by said current field ((0010), (0014), (0016), and (0054)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

24. As to claims 14, 35, and 56, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 13, 34 and 55 above. In addition, Quass discloses when a close match is found, mapping said field to said block type ((0037), and Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

25. As to claims 16, 37, and 58, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 23 and 44 above. In addition, Quass discloses traversing form elements in a second sequence, said second sequence a reverse of a first sequence, identifying mapping of at Yeast a field following a current field in said second sequence; and mapping said current field based on said mapping of said following field ((0054)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

26. As to claims 17, 38 and 59, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2, 23 and 44 above. In addition, Quass discloses traversing form elements in a first sequence; analyzing a visible display format hint proximate a field; comparing said analyzed display format hint with a dictionary of data entry prompts; mapping said field to a display format based on said comparison ((0052) and (0054)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

27. As to claims 18, 39, and 60, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 17, 38 and 59 above. In addition, Quass discloses any of concatenating; truncating and re-formatting said retrieved data according to said display format ((0052)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

28. As to claims 19, 40, and 61, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 17, 38 and 59 above. In addition, Quass discloses for a field lacking a proximate visible display format hint, mapping current field to same display format of a preceding field if both fields are the same field type ((0052) and (0054)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

29. As to claims 20, 41, and 62, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 22, and 43 above. In addition, Quass discloses identifying a form as a checkout form ((0012)). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light and Quass for the same reason as claim 1 above.

30. As to claim 64, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 43 above. In addition, both Light and Quass disclose a data file in a database used to map the form element. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that such a database may reside on either the client or on the server without affecting the functionality of the automatic form fill-in system.

31. Claims 21, 42 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light and Quass in view of Hind et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0135507 (hereinafter Hind).

32. As per claims 21, 42 and 63, Light and Quass teach the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 43 above. Light and Quass did not explicitly teach masking confidential data from being displayed. Hind teaches masking confidential data from being displayed (page 1, parag. 6 and page 12, parag. 106).

33. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Light Quass and Hind in order to enhance the security of Light's and Quass's automatic form fill-in methods by masking passwords using strings of asterisks so that no one can see what the actual passwords are.

34. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be

reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P.L.

W. C. Vaughn

WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100